

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

EX-3  
2015 JULY 27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re LENOVO ADWARE LITIGATION

Case No. 15-md-02624

**ORDER APPOINTING INTERIM LEAD  
COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, four motions to appoint interim lead counsel have been filed. Dkt. Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7. Counsel seeking appointment as interim lead counsel have also filed responses, Dkt. Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, and replies, Dkt. Nos. 27, 31, 32, 34. Defendant Lenovo also filed a response. Dkt. No. 18. The court held a hearing on plaintiffs' motions on July 17, 2015. For the reasons explained below, the court appoints Pritzker Levine LLP, Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy LLP, and Girard Gibbs LLP as interim lead counsel.

**I. BACKGROUND**

These cases arise out of a partnership between defendants Lenovo and Superfish to install Superfish's "Visual Discovery" software on millions of Lenovo computers. According to plaintiffs, the existence and function of Superfish's software was not disclosed to consumers and resulted in the interception and monitoring of millions of consumers' online activities, and defendant's unauthorized injection of advertisements into consumers' browsing sessions.

1       Following media reports of the Superfish software in early 2015, a number of putative  
2 class actions were filed in nine districts throughout the country. On June 8, 2015 the Judicial Panel  
3 on Multidistrict Litigation granted plaintiffs' motion to consolidate and transfer the actions for  
4 coordinated trial proceedings before this court. On June 24, 2015 the court issued an initial case  
5 management order consolidating all 27 actions (styled as *In re Lenovo Adware Litigation*) and  
6 setting forth the governing rules and procedure. Dkt. No. 8.

7       Plaintiffs subsequently stipulated to a schedule for the selection of interim lead counsel in  
8 the consolidated actions. *See* Case No. 15-0807, at Dkt. Nos. 39, 40. Plaintiffs' counsel in seven of  
9 the consolidated actions moved to be appointed interim lead counsel:

- 10       1. Block & Leviton, LLP ("Block & Leviton") and Van Laningham Duncan PLLC  
11           ("Van Laningham"), counsel in the *Wood* action (Case No. 15-2789), *see* Dkt.  
12           No. 3;
- 13       2. Pritzker Levine LLP ("Pritzker Levine"), Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy LLP  
14           ("Cotchett"), and Girard Gibbs LLP ("Girard Gibbs"), counsel in the *Sterling*, *JGX*,  
15           and *Estrella* actions (Case Nos. 15-807, 15-1113, and 15-1044, respectively), *see*  
16           Dkt. No. 5;
- 17       3. Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP ("Robbins Geller") and Edelson PC  
18           ("Edelson"), counsel in the *Pick* and *Hunter* actions (Case Nos. 15-2783 and 15-  
19           0819, respectively), *see* Dkt. No. 6; and
- 20       4. Joseph Saveri Law Firm, Inc. ("JSLF"), counsel in *Babbitt* action (Case No. 15-  
21           1712), *see* Dkt. No. 7.

22       Responses were filed by three of the four groups, as well as by defendant Lenovo. Dkt.  
23 Nos. 16, 18, 20, 21. Plaintiff Joel Foster filed a response in support of the selection of Robbins  
24 Geller and Edelson as interim lead counsel. Dkt. No. 19. Each of the four groups of firms filed a  
25 reply. Dkt. Nos. 27, 31, 32, 35.

26 **II. ANALYSIS**

27       Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(g) authorizes courts to "designate interim counsel to

1 act on behalf of a putative class before determining whether to certify the actions as a class  
2 action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(3). The rules provide four factors to guide a court’s selection of lead  
3 counsel:<sup>1</sup> (i) the work counsel has done in identifying or investigating potential claims in the  
4 action; (ii) counsel’s experience in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and the types  
5 of claims asserted in the action; (iii) counsel’s knowledge of the applicable law; and (iv) the  
6 resources counsel will commit to representing the class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(A). Under Rule  
7 23(g), courts may also “consider any other matter pertinent to counsel’s ability to fairly and  
8 adequately represent the interests of the class” and “order potential class counsel to provide  
9 information on any subject pertinent to the appointment.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(B), (C). In its  
10 initial case management order, the court noted two additional criteria it would consider beyond the  
11 four enumerated in Rule 23(g): (1) ability to work cooperatively with others; and (2) ability to  
12 maintain reasonable fees and expenses. Dkt. No. 8, at 7. Finally, any lead counsel appointed by the  
13 court “must fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(4).

14 On balance, consideration of these factors favors selection of Pritzker Levine, Cotchett,  
15 and Girard Gibbs (the “*Sterling* movants”) as interim lead counsel.

16 There is no question that all candidates are capable and accomplished advocates, with  
17 extensive experience in complex litigation, including class actions and cases involving technology  
18 and privacy claims. Nor does the court doubt that all will be willing to commit sufficient resources  
19 to the representation of the class. Each firm has also competently investigated the facts and law  
20 behind the claims advanced in each respective case, even if the various complaints reached  
21 different conclusions regarding which claims to assert.

22 Each of the movants argued at the hearing on this motion that as interim lead counsel they  
23 would adopt a “core discovery plan” to minimize unnecessary discovery costs and move the cases  
24 toward settlement, and each made arguments that their billing would be reasonable, fair, and  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> As noted in JSLF’s motion, the factors in Rule 23(g)(a)(A) are those a court must consider in  
27 appointing lead counsel, rather than *interim* lead counsel. However, courts have held that these  
28 same factors apply in to the selection of interim lead counsel. See, e.g., *In re Air Cargo Shipping  
Services Antitrust Litig.*, 240 F.R.D. 56, 57 (E.D.N.Y. 2006).

1 transparent. The court was persuaded that each movant would endeavor to maintain reasonable  
2 fees as interim lead counsel.<sup>2</sup> However, the court finds that weighing in favor of Pritzker Levine,  
3 Cotchett, and Girard Gibbs is the fact that each are headquartered in this district and each has  
4 proposed lead counsel who reside in this district. Although one of the *Wood* firms, Block &  
5 Leviton, has a presence in this district, they have proposed lead attorneys who reside in North  
6 Carolina and Massachusetts, which may lead to additional expenditures associated with travelling  
7 to this district. Likewise, the *Pick* and *Hunter* movants have presences in this district, but their  
8 proposed lead attorneys reside in San Diego, Boca Raton and Chicago. Finally, *Babbitt* counsel,  
9 JSLF, is situated in this district, but Babbitt's motion is unclear regarding to what extent JSLF,  
10 despite its application to be appointed sole interim lead counsel, intends to work in conjunction  
11 with attorneys from Karon LLC, Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C., and the Howard Law Firm, and  
12 where they reside.

13 Finally, while appointment of interim lead counsel is not a popularity contest, the court is  
14 persuaded that the extensive support garnered by the *Sterling* movants from the other plaintiffs  
15 and firms in these actions demonstrates their ability to work cooperatively with the many plaintiffs  
16 and attorneys involved in this case, and to do so in the best interests of the class. The movants do  
17 not disagree that the *Sterling* movants have the support of 84 of the 104 plaintiffs in 19 of the 27  
18 actions pending in eight of the nine judicial districts in which the consolidated actions were  
19 originally filed, and that this includes plaintiffs from 31 of the 33 states. Dkt. No. 5, at 15. While  
20 support from a large majority of plaintiffs and their counsel alone would not be sufficient reason  
21 to favor the *Sterling* movants, it does reflect a broad, nationwide level of support. The *Sterling*  
22 movants also took the lead in drafting a joint opposition to the motion filed before the JPML to  
23 transfer the litigation to the Eastern District of North Carolina, and argued at the MDL hearing in  
24 support of consolidation of the cases and transfer to this district. *Id.* at 5. Their memorandum filed  
25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> Moreover, the court notes that “[i]n a class action, the district court must ensure that the amount  
27 and mode of payment of attorney fees are fair and proper . . . .” See Comment to Fed. R. Civ. P.  
28 23(h). To this end, the court will ensure that any future fee award is fair, reasonable, and reflects  
the result actually achieved for class members, and the value conferred upon them.

1 with the JPML supporting transfer to this district was joined by plaintiffs in 19 of 21 actions that  
2 were pending at the time, and subsequently had the support of plaintiffs in three later-filed actions.  
3 *Id.* The fact that these movants have consistently enjoyed the support of a substantial majority of  
4 the plaintiffs and their counsel throughout this litigation is indicative of their ability to work  
5 cooperatively on behalf of the many plaintiffs in this case, and to work in their best interests.

6 **III. ORDER**

7 While all candidates are experienced, capable firms, the court finds Pritzker Levine,  
8 Cotchett, and Girard Gibbs particularly suitable to act as interim lead counsel at this juncture.  
9 Accordingly, the court hereby appoints Jonathan K. Levine and Elizabeth C. Pritzker of Pritzker  
10 Levine, Philip L. Gregory, Steven N. Williams, and Matthew K. Edling of Cotchett, and Daniel C.  
11 Girard and Elizabeth A. Kramer of Girard Gibbs as interim lead counsel.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: July 24, 2015

14   
15 Ronald M. Whyte  
16 United States District Judge

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

United States District Court  
Northern District of California